

Re Point V.

1 In the present opinion, reference is made to the following document:  
D1: EP 1 065 642 A (FUJITSU TEN LTD) January 3, 2001  
(2001-01-03)

2 Document D1 is regarded as the most proximate related art. It discloses a common parking assistance system.

2.1 The subject matter of Claim 1 differs from the system from D1 in that the oncoming traffic lane is taken into account and that a signal is provided if there is an intersection of the parking trajectory and the oncoming traffic lane.

2.2 The subject matter of Claim 1 is thus novel (Article 33 (2) PCT). The objective to be achieved in the present invention may thus be seen to lie in the task of also taking the oncoming traffic lane into account.

2.3 The recognition of the problem and the formulation of the objective itself, that is, to take the oncoming traffic lane into account as well when assessing the parking trajectory, as such already satisfies the requirements placed on inventive activity, Article 33(3) PCT.

Document D1 mentions in the paragraphs cited in the Search Report that the camera to be sure may also be used for a "lane-off monitoring". No indication is given, however, what an implementation could look like for one skilled in the art.

Furthermore, there is no talk there of a parking trajectory to be expected such that it remains open

whether D1 in this connection refers at all to a prognosis and not merely to a detection of a state that has already set in.

- 2.4 The Independent Claim 7 focussed on a device and formulated in analogy to Method Claim 1 satisfies the requirements of Article 33(2) and (3) PCT for the same reasons.
- 2.5 Claims 2-6 and 8-10 are dependent on Claim 1 and 7 respectively and thus likewise satisfy the requirements of the PCT with reference to novelty and inventive activity.